

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको उसकी सूचना
पहुँचाई जाएगी ।

RE: SECRET SESSION

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Speaker, I had suggested that this House go into a secret sitting to consider the National Emergency. I understand that a large number of Opposition leaders also concurred in the view. Although the Prime Minister earlier said that this was not the opportune time for this purpose, I understand the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs had undertaken or indicated that he would convey this to the Government and convey to us the decision of the Government finally on this matter.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Defence and Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I received a request to that effect from some Members. I gave careful consideration to it. I think that, at the present moment, it would not be desirable to have a secret session. If it is desirable in future, I shall make my submission to you. The issues before the House are of high interest to the whole country. Right at the beginning to ask for a secret session would have a bad effect on the country. I am sure hon. Members would agree.

Mr. Speaker: He may kindly move the Resolutions also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There are two Resolutions standing to my name. I should like your guidance as to whether I should take them together.

Mr. Speaker: They might be moved one after the other. Both would be placed before the House. He can make one speech. Discussion also would be simultaneous.

12.25 hrs.

RESOLUTIONS RE: PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY AND AGGRESSION BY CHINA

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Defence and Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker: I shall place it before the House.

Resolution moved:

"This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency issued by the President on the 26th of October, 1962, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution."

The hon. Prime Minister may move the other resolution also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I beg to move:

"This House notes with deep regret that in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful coexistence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces.

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers...

Several Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:

...and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honours and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all-out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

Mr. Speaker: I shall place this Resolution also before the House.

Resolution moved:

"This House notes with deep regret that, in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful coexistence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel

which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces.

This House places on record its high appreciation of the valiant struggle of men and officers of our armed forces while defending our frontiers and pays its respectful homage to the martyrs who have laid down their lives in defending the honour and integrity of our Motherland.

This House also records its profound appreciation of the wonderful and spontaneous response of the people of India to the emergency and the crisis that has resulted from China's invasion of India. It notes with deep gratitude this mighty upsurge amongst all sections of our people for harnessing all our resources towards the organisation of an all-out effort to meet this grave national emergency. The flame of liberty and sacrifice has been kindled anew and a fresh dedication has taken place to the cause of India's freedom and integrity.

This House gratefully acknowledges the sympathy and the moral and material support received from a large number of friendly countries in this grim hour of our struggle against aggression and invasion.

With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we meet in Parliament today earlier than was intended, because of a grave crisis that has arisen. This House, and everybody in India, and the greater part of the world know that the People's Republic of China has invaded India with massive forces,

and there have been some bloody battles resulting in considerable casualties on both sides.

For five years, we have been the victims of Chinese aggression across our frontiers in the north. That aggression was, to begin with, rather furtive. Occasionally there were some incidents and conflicts. These conflicts might well be termed frontier incidents. Today, we are facing a regular and massive invasion of our territory by very large forces.

China, which has claimed and still claims to be anti-imperialist, is pursuing a course today for which comparisons can only be sought in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those past days, the European Powers in the full flood of imperialist aggression and with strength and weapons given to them by the Industrial Revolution took possession of large parts of Asia and Africa by force. That imperialism has abated now, and many of the colonies of European countries have been freed and are independent countries. But, curiously, the very champions of anti-imperialism, that is, the People's Government of China, are now following the course of aggression and imperialist expansion.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Down with China.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is sad to think that we in India, who have pleaded for peace all over the world, and who have sought the friendship of China and treated them with courtesy and consideration and pleaded their cause in the councils of the world should now ourselves be victims of new imperialism and expansionism by a country which says that it is against all imperialism. This strange twist of history has brought us face to face with something that we have not experienced in this way for over a hundred years or more. We had taken it almost for granted that despite some lapses in recent years, as in the Suez

affair, we had taken it for granted that this type of aggression was almost a thing of the past. Even the Chinese aggression on our borders during the last five years, bad as it was, and indicative of an expansionist tendency, though it troubled us greatly, hardly led us to the conclusion that China would indulge in a massive invasion of India. Now, we have seen and experienced this very invasion and it has shocked us, as it has shocked a large number of countries.

History has taken a new turn in Asia and perhaps the world, and we have to bear the brunt of it, to fight with all our might this menace to our freedom and integrity. Not only are we threatened by it, but all the standards of international behaviour have been upset and so all the world is affected by it, apart from the immediate consequences. No self-respecting country which loves its freedom and its integrity can possibly submit to this challenge. Certainly, India, this dear land of ours, will never submit to it whatever the consequences. We accept the challenge in all its consequences, whatever they may be.

It may be that this challenge is also an opportunity for us. Indeed, the people of India in their millions have demonstrated that they accept this challenge and have shown a unity and an enthusiasm such as has been very seldom in evidence. A crisis has come and we have stood up to face it and meet that crisis.

I have moved a Resolution seeking the approval of this House to the state of emergency that has been declared by the President. That was inevitable when foreign legions invaded India and our Constitution wisely provided for such a course to be followed by us in any serious crisis. I have no doubt that this House will approve of this declaration by the President and subsequently I hope also of the Defence of India Ordinance and the other steps that are being taken to face this crisis.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I should like this House for a moment to look at this matter in some perspective. We stand, I do believe, at a turning point not only in the history of India but of Asia and possibly even of the world, because what happens in this conflict will affect it obviously. It will affect Asia, of which two of the biggest countries are China and India. But it will affect the world also and, therefore, this conflict has very wide-reaching consequences. We should try to look at it from this point of view. For the moment, we are shocked at this cruel and crude invasion of another country. The world has also witnessed the response of the people of the country invaded, that is, our country, and the world will yet witness the way the people of India act when their freedom is threatened and their dear liberty is imperilled.

So, we are shocked and in a state of high excitement. That is inevitable, and not surprising, but we have to remember that this turning point in history is not going to end soon. We may have to face this for a long period, for a number of years, I do not know how long, and we must train ourselves and the nation to be prepared to face it, however long the crisis may last. It is in the mood, in that mentality, that I seek this House to give a lead to the country.

Chinese aggression on our frontiers is five years old and during these years this House has discussed this matter repeatedly. On the last occasion this discussion took place on the 12th August, 1962. Many White Papers have been issued, giving the long-drawn-out correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of China. Only today I have placed another bunch of these papers contained in White Paper No. 7. On the 22nd August, 1962 we sent a note to China. A reply was sent to this on the 13th September last. But before the reply was sent or received by us, even on the 8th September,

China's forces crossed the international boundary in the northwest corner of NEFA across the Thagla ridge and began to threaten the Indian post at Dhola. We had a number of posts near the northern frontier of NEFA adequate enough to meet any minor or normal incursion. We hoped that we would be able to meet this new aggression and immediately we took steps to strengthen our forces in that area.

Five days after this new aggression, on the 13th September the Chinese Government sent us a threatening reply, asking for discussions on the boundary question. We have previously demonstrated by a mass of evidence that our boundary is what has been called the MacMahon Line, but the boundary was not laid down even by Mr. MacMahon, whoever is responsible for it. It was a recognition of the long-standing frontier on the high ridge of the Himalayas which divided the two countries at the watershed. To some extent, though indirectly, the Chinese accepted this. Certainly they accepted the continuation of this line in Burma. But, apart from the constitutional or legal aspects, it is undoubted and cannot be challenged that no Chinese has ever been in that part on this side of the line, excepting, as the House knows, in a little border village called Longju.

Even the MacMahon Line which the Chinese have called illegal was laid down 48 years ago, in 1914, and that was a confirmation of what was believed in then. Legal or not, it has been a part of India for a long number of years and certainly let us say for 50 years or so, apart from its previous history which is also in our favour. Here then is a boundary which for nearly 50 years has been shown to be our northern frontier. I am limiting what I say to 50 years for the sake of argument; really it was even before that. Even if the Chinese did not accept it—and I would like

to say that the objection they raised in 1913 to this treaty was not based on their objection to the MacMahon Line; it was based on their objection to another part of the treaty which divided Inner Tibet and Outer Tibet, the MacMahon Line did not come in that; however, it is a fact that they objected to the whole treaty because of that other objection—even if the Chinese did not accept it then, this has been in existence now in our maps, in our practice, in our Constitution, in our organisation, administration etc., for nearly 50 years. Even the non-acceptance of it, can it entitle them to undertake an armed invasion to upset it? Even the Chinese know and say that independent India has been in possession of this territory right up to the Himalayan watershed. It is rather difficult for me to say what they say. Because, if any person takes the trouble to read through this vast correspondence, he will notice that their alleged frontier is a very mobile one; it changes. It is wherever they have laid the frontier and in this matter too they have stated many contradictory things. They have laid stress sometimes on the fact that we have occupied this area of NEFA or a large part of it since we became independent. That is a curious statement since, as I have said all along, it was fully recognised in 1913-14. Apart from that, when we became independent, we did one thing. We naturally wanted these tribal people in the frontier areas to share our independence. The British largely left them to their own resources and interfered only when there was some trouble. But there is no doubt that the British considered their frontier to be the MacMahon Line. They did not have a full-fledged administrative apparatus there. On gaining independence, we were naturally anxious to develop these areas as we were trying to develop other areas of India. We tried, therefore, not only to introduce our administration there but schools, hospitals, roads, etc. It is this which the Chinese say represents our occupying that. Any person

who sees these papers and the history behind them would easily say that we have occupied it in every sense, legally, constitutionally, administratively, practically for a large number of years.

Now, the point is that whatever the legal and constitutional aspect of their claim might be we think there is no force whatever—does that justify a sudden invasion of this kind? The House will remember that we have discussed this matter many times previously; we discussed it largely in relation to their aggression in Ladakh because nothing had happened here except with the sole exception of the little frontier village Longju. Repeatedly, in the course of talks sometimes they are reflected in these papers too—we were given to understand something not absolutely, not clearly; as has now been discovered, always their phrases had a double meaning attached to them which could be interpreted any way, to assure us of something and later to deny that they had assured us. I remember the long talk I had with the Chinese Prime Minister, specially about the MacMahon Line. I forget the exact date; it was five years ago or six years ago; I do not remember exactly. That was when he came to India. We had a long talk and immediately after the talk I put down in a note I prepared the contents of our talk so that I might not forget it. That note is here in our office. Much later I sent an extract of my note of that talk to the Chinese Government and they denied the truth of it! I was very much surprised and hurt because I was quite certain. When we were talking it was not once I asked; I asked the same question two or three times and definitely the answer was given to me. He gave me to understand that although the Chinese Government considered the McMahon line an illegal line and a British imperialist line, nevertheless because of the large number of facts, because of their desire to be friendly with us, they would be prepared to do this. That was the clearest impression that I got.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

He denied it later on. So, it becomes a little difficult to say what they stood by at a particular time.

Anyhow, my point is that whether they acknowledge the McMahon line or not undoubtedly it has been, till a few weeks ago, completely in our possession; the area on this side was completely in our possession; for generations past it has been in our possession; if you like it I can put a later date, 1913-14 and I may say that it was a recording of what had been happening previously. How does it justify the Chinese Government to carry on an invasion of it, by any law, international standards of behaviour or for any other reason?

The House may have noticed a very peculiar approach that the Chinese Government has made to what has happened recently in NEFA. They go on saying that India attacked them and their frontier guards as they are called are merely defending themselves. I must confess that this complete perversion of facts and the attempt to make falsehood appear to be the truth, and the truth to be the falsehood has amazed me because nothing can be more utterly baseless than what they have been saying. Here is a single fact. We have been up to the McMahon line all these years; we have not gone one inch beyond nor have we covered another's territory. They have come. Let us for the moment assume their case that there is some doubt about where the McMahon line is. But the point is that they have invaded an area which has not been in their possession ever, ever in the history of the last 10,000 years. After all the present Chinese Government came into existence 12 years ago or thereabouts. Any claim that they may directly make to this territory can only be made either in these 12 years or possibly previously through Tibet. So, it becomes a question of what they can claim through Tibet or through their domination over Tibet.

It is true that for a long time past there were some frontier questions between Tibet and India, even in British times. But all these questions were about little pockets or little frontier areas, small areas. Nobody has ever put forward, no Tibetan Government has ever put forward previously these large claims to what tantamounts to two thirds of NEFA, apart from the vast area in Ladakh.

So, we arrive at one firm conclusion which is not capable of argument or denial; that is, the Chinese have come to this territory with a massive force, territory which for a long time at least has been included in India, and administered in a vague way and a little fully administered by India. If they had and claim they could have discussed it and talked about it and adopted various means of peaceful settlement, appointed arbitrators or gone to the Hague Court or whatever it was.

Here, I may say, it has been unfortunate, in this as in so many other cases, that the present Government of China is not represented in the United Nations. Hon. Members are surprised when we have supported the Chinese representation—the representation of the People's Government of China—in the United Nations. We have supported it in spite of this present invasion, because we have to look at it this way: it is not a question of likes or dislikes. It is a question, which will facilitate Chinese aggression; it will facilitate its misbehaviour in the future. It will make disarmament impossible in the world. You might disarm the whole world and leave China, a great, powerful country, fully armed to the teeth. It is inconceivable. Therefore, in spite of our great resentment at what they have done, the great irritation and anger, still, I am glad to say that we kept some perspective about things and supported that even now. The difficulty is one cannot call

them up before any tribunal or world court or anywhere. They are just wholly an irresponsible country believing, I believe, in war as the only way of settling anything, having no love of peace and stating almost that, and with great power at their disposal. That is the dangerous state of affairs not only for India but for the rest of the world. I am not going into the question, as some people do, of communism or anti-Communism. I do not believe that that is a major issue in this matter or any other. Communism may help; but the major issue is, an expansionist, imperialist minded country deliberately invading into a new country.... (Interruption).

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): With a slave army.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know what the hon. Member has said. I am not entering into that argument. I am laying stress on this fact, because as some countries do, they explain everything in terms of communism and anti-communism. I think the result is that they are unable to see many of the basic facts of the question. Communism may help or communism may hinder. Communism may give them a certain strength or weakness, whatever it may be. But today we are facing a naked aggression, just the type of aggression which we saw in the 18th and 19th centuries; there was then no communism anywhere.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): This is the 20th century.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So, we have to face this new type of imperialism on our borders. Asia is facing this new type, and the whole world is concerned with that. For the moment, we are most concerned with it, and we have to face it and bear the burden ourselves, although some of our friendly countries are certainly helping us and we are grateful to them for that help.

To say that we are committing all this aggression on Chinese territory is a kind of double talk which is very difficult for a man of my simple mind to understand. "We commit aggression on ourselves; we commit aggression on the soil of our own country and they defend it by coming over the mountains into our territory". It is really extraordinary to what length people can go to justify their misdeeds.

It is true that when we heard on the 8th September of their coming over the Thagla pass into our territory in some forces, we had quite adequate forces in our posts. We had no doubt some forces there to meet any incursion, but if large forces come over, an ordinary military post can hardly resist them. We took immediate steps to send further forces to reinforce our posts. We sent them immediately as we had to, in the circumstances; yet there was one unfortunate factor which normally should be remembered. That was, if we send our forces, who are tough, young and strong, nevertheless, we send them from the plains of India suddenly to 14,000 ft. high. For any person; however strong he may be, it requires time to be acclimatised to these heights. But they went there. When they went there, then began a process; we sent some further forces and thought that they would be adequate to meet the Chinese menace in so far as it was feasible. The Chinese also started increasing their forces there. Now, for them, it was a relatively easy matter, because they have vast forces in Tibet. I do not know how much they have. They used to have 11 divisions, and I am told they now have 13 or 14 divisions in Tibet. Just imagine the very vast armies they are having in Tibet alone.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल): अब तो आपको चाइनीज की सनोवृत्ति का पता चल गया होगा . .

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I think, if the hon. Member feels keenly about

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

it, we will send him to the frontier! Perhaps the speeches may convince the Chinese. So, first of all, the Chinese armies were fully acclimatised, living for long on the high plateau of Tibet. It was just not in the line with the ridge but only a little below the ridge.

Secondly, the whole of Tibet has been covered in the last few years by roads, and the roads there, in that extremely severe climate, mean simply levelling the ground, removing boulders, etc., because you do not require cement or anything at that height. The ground itself is so very hard. So, this is covered by roads, and they can travel perhaps at quick notice from one part to another in Tibet.

So, they could bring large forces to the other side of the Thagla ridge. They would not be immediately visible to us, because on the other side—and that is what we believe happened—although some forces were being added on by the Chinese crossing the Thagla ridge they could not be seen. They were adding large numbers of forces on the other side nearby and in the last few days of this battle that occurred there on the 20th, they poured in masses of the people. I do not know how much: six, seven and eight times the number of troops that we had. They have thus logistic advantage not only of bringing troops but supplying everything that could be brought immediately on the other side of the Thagla ridge and send them. We had a certain disadvantage. I am merely mentioning the facts—the logistic disadvantage of the people having been suddenly sent to those heights. Everything that they require has to be sent by air, and our Air Force has done a very fine piece of work there, in taking everything by air in spite, sometimes, of enemy fire and the difficulties that always occur in those high mountains. So, this went on.

May I add that there has been a great deal of attack about our unpreparedness. I think most of it is based on ignorance. (*Interruption*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We do not want to interrupt; you may go on replying in your own way.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am glad of this generosity in not interrupting me. I say most of this talk is based on ignorance of facts. Some of them is true: first of all, it is perfectly true that we were not prepared to face two or three divisions of the Chinese army descending upon the forces there.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक आप क्या कर रहे थे (*Interruptions*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मुन तो लीजिये आराम से, इस तरह इंटरप्शन करने से कैसे काम चलेगा ?

13 hrs.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : यह दुराग्रह में आज तक फंसे रहे और अब हमारी बात मुनना भी नहीं पसन्द करते ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मुन तो लें आराम से ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मैं तो यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह क्या कर रहे थे ? वह लोग हमला कर रहे थे तब यह क्या कर रहे थे ?

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : जब स्वामी जी ने कुछ कहा तो हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि उनको फंटियर को भज दो । फंटियर में जायेंगे हमारे बच्चे, वह वहादुर हैं । वह चीन तक जायेंगे और जीत कर आयेंगे । (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Swamiji, I am afraid, has not acquired....

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
स्वामी जी की परेशानी यह है कि व इस बोली
को समझते नहीं हैं, आप उनको समझाइये ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : यही मैं कह
रहा था कि मुश्किल यह है कि स्वामी जी
कुछ भी नहीं समझते ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : स्वामी जी सब
कुछ समझते हैं (Interruptions).

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : यह बोली की
बात नहीं है ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय,
किसी माननीय सदस्य के लिये यह कहना कि
वह कुछ समझते नहीं हैं, यह ठीक नहीं है ।
(Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मेरी तकलीफ
को भी समझें । अगर स्वामी जी इस बोली
को नहीं समझते और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब
दूसरी बोली में बोलें तो कई और माननीय
सदस्य नहीं समझेंगे । इसलिये यह तो सुन
लीजिये । उसके बाद हम देखेंगे कि स्वामी
जी को कैसे समझाया जाय ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : प्रधान मंत्री जी
ने एक बार यह भी किया था कि इस देश की
बोली में यहां बोले थे । अब यह अंग्रेजी में
बोल रहे हैं । यदि इस प्रश्न पर हिन्दी में
बोलते तो अच्छा होता ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जब मैंने वही मन्त्री ने
पहले कहा था तो आप ने कहा था कि वह सब
भाषण छपे हुए हैं हिन्दी में ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो कोई अजब
बात नहीं कि स्वामी जी को इलाहाम हो
जाय पहले से लेकिन इस समय तो
हमको सुनने दीजिये । (Interruptions).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : हमको हुआ है
यही हम कहते हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब स्वामी जी
आराम से बैठेंगे ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry
not to be able to oblige the Swamiji.
I would have been glad to oblige him,
but my difficulty is, as you yourself
have been pleased to remark, in a
matter of this kind, there are many
Members of this House who might not
understand me otherwise.

I was talking about unprepared-
ness. It is perfectly true, as I said,
that we were unprepared to meet a
massive invasion of two or three
divisions. But the other things that
are said about roads, about blankets,
etc. are very largely incorrect. . . .
(Interruptions).

Shri Mohan Swarup (Pilibhit):
What about arms?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is really
extraordinary that many persons here
who know nothing about arms talk
about arms. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Let us hear the hon.
Prime Minister. All sections shall
have their opportunity to express
themselves. We are now listening to
the Prime Minister.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not
wish to go into details. I merely
wanted to indicate that the criticisms
that are made, partly justified, are
largely not justified. About arms, it
is not a thing which one normally
talks about in Parliament openly.
But I would be glad to explain what
we have done, what we have not
done and the difficulties that we had
to face.

The hon. House will remember that
till independence, our defence de-
partment was entirely under the war
office, and the war office not only
laid down the policy, but insisted that
everything as far as possible should
be acquired through Whitehall.
During the last great war, because of
the difficulties of acquiring war mate-
rial from abroad, from the United

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Kingdom, some of our ordnance factories grew up, but still they were rather elementary. The first problem we had to solve, therefore, was to get out of this Whiehail atmosphere and the practice of our acquiring everything from there, determining our own policy and all that. I think we have done rather well to build up in these years this industry.

There is always a choice and there has been a choice in this and other matters for us to buy arms from abroad or to make them ourselves. Obviously it is infinitely better to make them ourselves, because that strengthens the country; industrially and otherwise and secondly, you cannot altogether rely on outside supplies; any moment they may fail you and economically it is bad to get them from outside. So, our practice has been to try to build up our arms, the industry and the like in the country and we have done fairly well. We might have done better; I do not know. All kinds of difficulties arise, because development of one industry depends on the whole industrial background of the country. We have laid stress on that. I would not go into that.

A great deal was said about arms, automatic rifles and the rest. For the last three or four years, we have been trying to make them and various difficulties arose about patents, this, that and the other and sometimes about our own difficulties in finding enough foreign exchange. This has been a continuing difficulty, as to now much we should spend in the shape of foreign exchange. Ultimately, we got over these difficulties and we started their manufacture, I forget the date, but some time this year and we are now making them.

The only alternative was previously for us to get a large number of those weapons from abroad. We hesitated; we wanted to make them ourselves. Undoubtedly, we could have got them, but remember this. If we have tried to get all those weapons

from abroad in what might be called relatively peace time, we will have to spend enormous sums of money. Our whole planning, etc. will have gone, because when you talk of weapons in terms of war, you talk in terms of thousands of crores. It is not a question of a few crores, but thousands of crores and it would have smashed our economy. It is a different matter when we have to face this tremendous crisis, which both our people feel so much and the world sees; we can get better terms to get the things and our people are prepared to spend much more.

I am merely pointing out some things; they may not be adequate explanation, but I want you to appreciate that every attempt has been made and continually being made to build up industry—an aircraft industry, an arms industry, etc., an up-to-date one. Obviously we cannot be up-to-date in the sense of competing, let us say, with America or the Soviet Union or England. It is just not possible for us to advance our basic industries and science so much. But we have made good advance scientifically. One of the most important features is that the defence science department that we have built up is a high-class affair, employing about 2,000 scientists.

Anyhow, if there were mistakes committed or delays committed, it is not for me to go into that now. It is not a good thing for us to apportion blame and say that such and such officer or such and such Minister, etc. is to blame. We are all to blame in a sense. (*Interruptions*).

It is a fact that ever since 1st October, when I returned from abroad every day I have been connected—previously I was connected through the Defence Ministry, but from the 1st October, I have been there every day. We, the Chiefs of Staff and others sat together and discussed the matters. And, naturally, it is for the

experts, the Chiefs of Staff and their advisers to determine the tactics, the strategy etc., of fighting, and not for me; I do not know enough about it. I can only put questions to them, make suggestions to them, leaving the final carrying out of it to their hands.

We took several steps. On the very next day, on 2nd October, we called back the Chief of the General Staff, General Kaul, who was on leave then. I want to mention his name specially because, quite extraordinarily unjust things have been said about him. We sent for him and we changed the method of command, separating Naga Hills etc., from NEFA. He went there practically within 24 hours. Some people say he had not had any experience of fighting. That is not correct. He had the experience of fighting in Burma. He was our Military Attache in Washington when the trouble occurred in Kashmir, but he begged us to send him there. We sent him there and he was there. I doubt, knowing a good many of our officers and others,—many of them are good—in sheer courage and initiative and hard work, if we can find anybody to beat him. Anyhow, it is very unfair for our officers who are bearing heavy burden, whether it be Kaul or anybody else, to be criticised in this way, criticised by foreign correspondents sending messages abroad. That is a highly improper, highly irresponsible thing to be done when they are bearing such heavy burden.

Then, General Kaul, as soon as he went over there—he went there suddenly from here—14,000 feet—daily walked 16 to 20 miles from post to post over highly precipitous mountain area. He fell ill and he came here to report after 4 or 5 days.

श्री र. मेहरानन्द : जो मारे गये उनका क्या बना जी ? क्या उनका वहां लाज नहीं हुआ ?

1962(Ai) LSD—6.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैं स्वामी जी से एक प्रार्थना करूंगा। हम इस वक्त हंसी मजाक नहीं कर रहे हैं। हम बहुत ग्रहम बातों पर गौर कर रहे हैं जिनसे भारत का भविष्य बंधा हुआ है। वह समझते हैं कि हम हंसी मजाक कर रहे हैं।

श्री र. मेहरानन्द : हम आपके साथ हैं (Interruptions).

हम आपके साथ हैं। देश के लिए मरने के लिए तैयार हैं। हमारी सुनो तो सही।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would first ask the hon. Members on these benches, on the Congress side, not to interfere or take into their own hands the right to silence any other hon. Member. I think I am competent enough. I will deal with any hon. Member who interrupts or who says things like that. Wherever I need the help of all those hon. Members I will request them. But I think I would not need that. I hope hon. Members on this side would not compel me to go to that extent. They will have ample opportunity to have their say. I will allow them as much as they want. Now they should listen patiently. When their turn comes and when they speak, if they are interrupted in this manner they would not like that. Therefore, we should listen to the Prime Minister in order to be able to criticise what he has said. If they do not listen to him, how shall the hon. Members on this side criticise those facts that he is giving. Let him have his say. When their opportunity comes they can criticise him.

श्री र. मेहरानन्द : आप हमें समझाने लगे हैं तो दो शब्द हिन्दी में बोल दें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने यही कहा कि आप अभी खामोश रहें, आप की भी बारी आएगी और उस वक्त आप खूब कहें जितना आपका जी चाहे।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would like to point out to the House a fact, which is no doubt known, that this invasion by the Chinese did not merely take place in NEFA on the 20th October. On that very day it was a co-ordinated attack all along the line from Ladakh to NEFA. Therefore, to say that because we had attacked them—we are perfectly justified in pushing them and attacking them—in NEFA, to make that an excuse and say that we had attacked them in NEFA and therefore they are attacking us on that day all along the line of Ladakh is a thing which is manifestly a false statement, a made-up thing.

Now, a few days after the 20th October—I think it was 24th—a message was sent to the heads of Governments or heads of States in cases where it may be so, almost all of them, pointing out the background of Chinese invasion and stating our firm resolve to resist it—a copy of it I have placed on the Table of the House. We have received many replies, not from all yet but from many of them, extending their sympathy and support at the present crisis.

Just soon after, four or five days after this massive attack, the Chinese Prime Minister came out with, what is called, a "three-point proposal" on which a ceasefire might be arrived. This was very vague. It was not quite clear what he meant. But what appeared to us and what appeared later on to us with further elucidation was that it meant our not only acknowledging or partly acknowledging their right to be where they were on our territory, but our force retiring still further, some 20 kilometres or so; that is to say, although the Chinese armies would retire a little on our territory we would retire further and they would have an opportunity to build up their strength on our territory to attack us further later. It is an impossible thing for us to agree to. There has been some confusion about this in the countries, not only here

but in other countries too, but as we have explained it most people have understood it—I am talking about other countries.

We, in reply or independently or, rather, proposed that they should retire to the line prior to the 8th September, that is, behind the McMahon Line there and they should also retire the advances they had made since the 8th September in Ladakh. Some of our friends have said that this was a weak proposal, we should have asked them to go out completely. Well, it is for the House to judge our weakness and strength, and the proposals must have some realities, because we have not only to abide by it but we have to convince all our friends elsewhere that we are making something, a proposal which is reasonable and which can be given effect to. The proposal was that they should retire to that line as it stood on 8th September both in NEFA and Ladakh. Then we were prepared to meet their representatives to consider what further steps should be taken to lessen tension etc. Once that was agreed to, then would come as a third step our meeting together to consider the merits of the question. We have made that proposal and we stand by it. I think it is a reasonable proposal and certainly not in any sense a dishonourable or a weak one.

Then, meanwhile, many of our friends abroad, well-intentioned countries, made various efforts to bring about cease-fire, stoppage of fighting and a consideration of the matter on the merits. Their efforts, or rather their desire, to help in stopping this fighting is very laudable, and we welcome their desire. But, not knowing all the detailed facts, sometimes they made some proposals which had no great relevance to the situation.

I shall refer only to one of them and that was the reference made by President Nasser of the UAR. I must pay my tribute to President Nasser in

this matter because he did not make a vague proposal in the air. People advise us to be good and peaceful, as if we are inclined to war. In fact, if we are anything, as the House well knows, we do not possess the war-like mentality and that is why for the purpose of war there is weakness. We may have developed it, but that is a different matter, I am talking of the past. So, people talking to us to be good boys and make it up has no particular meaning, unless they come to grips with the particular issues involved. Now, President Nasser took the trouble to understand the facts and, thereafter, issued a presidential decree or communique issued by the President-in-Council of the UAR in which he made certain proposals. These proposals were not exactly on the lines we had suggested but were largely in conformity with our proposals. They laid special stress on troops withdrawing to their lines where they stood prior to the 8th of September. That was a major thing. That fitted in with our proposal. China has rejected this proposal, made by President Nasser.

Now, this crisis is none of our making or seeking. It is China which has sought to enforce its so-called territorial claims by military might. Indeed, she has advanced beyond the line of her territorial claims. As I said, their frontier is a mobile one; anything they could grasp becomes their frontier.

In his task, in defending our frontiers and our motherland, we have sought help from all friendly countries. I wish to express my gratitude for the prompt response to our appeal for sympathy and support which have been given to us by various countries. This help that is given is unconditional and without any strings. It does not therefore, affect directly our policy of non-alignment which we value. Those countries, which have helped us have themselves recognised this and made it clear that they do not expect us to

leave that policy. Help has been given to us swiftly by the United States, by the United Kingdom and by some other friendly countries. We are in touch with many others. We have also made approaches to other friendly countries like the Soviet Union and France for supply of equipment.

We have often declared that we do not covet any territory of anyone else; we are quite satisfied with our own territory such as it is. But there is another aspect of that. We do not submit to anyone else coveting our territory and although the aggressor in this instance has gained some initial successes—I do not know what they have in mind, whether they want to use it as a bargaining counter or they have some other evil designs—as I have said we cannot submit to it, whatever the consequences.

There is one other aspect which I should like to mention, which is not indirectly connected with this matter but directly connected, and that is our development plans and the Five Year Plan. Some people have said "let us give up these Plans so that we may concentrate on the war effort". What is the war effort? People think of the soldiers in the front, which is perfectly right. They are bearing the brunt of the heat and danger. But in this matter, in the kind of struggle that we are involved in, every peasant in the field is a soldier, every worker in a factory is a soldier. Our work, our war effort essentially, apart from the actual fighting done, is in ever greater production in the field and factory. We must remember that. It is an effort which depends greatly on our development. Today we are much more in a position to make that kind of effort in field and factory than, let us say, ten or twelve years ago; there is no doubt about that. We are not still adequately developed. I hope this very crisis will make us always to be remembered that an

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

army today, a modern army, fights with modern weapons which it has to manufacture itself in that country. It is based on the development of industry, and that industry must have an agricultural base if it is to succeed. Therefore, we have to develop all round, apart from agriculture and industry, which are the basic things in our Five Year Plan. Then there is power, which is essential from the point of view of war effort, from the point of view of industry, from the point of view of even agriculture. So that, to talk of scrapping the Five Year Plan is not to understand the real springs of our strength. We have to carry the Five Year Plan and go beyond it in many respects. It may be, in some matters which are considered non-essential, we may tone down or leave them but in the major things of the Five Year Plan we have to make the fullest effort. Among the major things agriculture is highly important. How can a country fight when it is lacking in food? But I do not think we will be. We have to grow more and more, which is a difficult thing. We have laid down the targets for our agricultural produce in our Five Year Plan, but in the last year or two, this year especially, we have fallen behind because of floods and all kinds of things.

Now, although we have fallen behind, I take it that we have to aim at higher targets than we have laid down even in the Third Plan, and I am sure we shall get that. I am not talking vaguely. I think we can get that. We cannot get it so easily if we laid down certain targets in the office here in the Food Ministry. We must go down to the peasant, to the agriculturist, and transform his present enthusiasm, his present energy into greater production. Nothing is more cheering and heartening than the reaction amongst the people, amongst the peasants who have given their little mite. Let them transform

them into greater production. I am sure they can, if we approach them rightly. So also with industry; so also with many other things like education etc. We must look upon all of them as part of the war effort that we have to make. In this process I hope we shall not only build up our nation more swiftly but will make it stronger, make it more social-minded and lay the base of the socialist structure that we aim at.

This peril we have to face is a grave menace. This challenge may be converted into opportunity for us to grow and to change the dark cloud that envelops our frontiers into the bright sun not only of freedom but of welfare in this country.

In effect we have to look at this matter as an effort of the whole nation. We may say—some people say—we want an armed people. That is true in a sense. But what we really want is the whole people mobilised for this effort doing their separate jobs whether it is in the field, the factory or the battlefield thus combining together and strengthening the nation and bringing success to us. We have to be armed, therefore, not only by weapons of warfare but by weapons of agriculture, industry and all those as well.

We do not minimise our task. Let no man minimise it or have any illusions about it. It is not a thing which we can deal with by momentary enthusiasm, enthusiasm of the moment or lasting a month or two. It is a long effort that we require—a difficult effort—and we shall have to go out to do our utmost. It is not merely enough to pay something to the Defence Fund or to do something else. That is good in its own way. It is very welcome how people are paying them by straining every nerve to the utmost. We have to keep up our strength and our determination to the end. And that end may not be near. Therefore we have to prepare in every way to strengthen the nation

not only for today and tomorrow but for the day after also to meet this menace. If we do that, I have no doubt that we shall be able to show the determination and fortitude that is required of our people. We have had a glimpse of it in their present enthusiasm which has been a most moving sight. To see our people come, not only the young but the old—old men and old women—and the young little children and their enthusiasm has been a sight to gladden any heart.

Now before I end I should like to say a word about our soldiers and airmen who are working under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. I want to send on your behalf our greetings and assurance of our full assistance. To those who have fallen in defence of the country we pay our homage. They will not be forgotten by us or by those who follow us. I am confident that all sides of this House will stand united in this great venture and will demonstrate to the world that free India which has stood for peace and will always stand for peace and friendship with other countries can never tolerate aggression and invasion. If we have worked for peace as we have done and we shall continue to do so, we can also work for war effectively if we are attacked as we have been.

Sir, I commend these Resolutions to the House.

Mr. Speaker: I have placed both these Resolutions before the House. Now I have to take up the substitute motions and amendments that I have received notice of. The first is by Dr. Singhvi. Does he want to move it?

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Yes, Sir; I wish to move my substitute motion (Serial No. 1).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I wish to move the amendment to the Resolution (No. 2, List No. 2).

श्री प्रकाशचोर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
चूँकि मेरा उद्देश्य पूरा हो गया है, इसलिए मैं अपने संशोधन संख्या ३ को वापस लेता हूँ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I wish to move amendment No. 4.

Shri K. Pattaayak (Sambalpur): I wish to move amendments No. 5 and 6.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): I wish to move amendments No. 7 and No. 8.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): My amendment No. 9 has become unnecessary by the resignation of the former Defence Minister but I wish to move my amendment No. 10.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): I wish to move amendment No. 11.

Shri Ram Ratan Gupta (Gonda): I wish to move amendment No. 12.

श्री राम सेवक य.दव : मैं अपना संशोधन संख्या १३ प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

Shri Parashar (Shivpuri): I wish to move my amendment No. 14.

Mr. Speaker: Then I have received notices of two amendments from Shri N. G. Ranga and some other hon. Members. Does he wish to move them?

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Yes, Sir.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Why were they circulated so late?

Mr. Speaker: Probably they were received late but I have allowed them. Then, there is one by Shri Sivamurthi Swami.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami (Koppal): I wish to move it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It has not been circulated.